

REMARKS

Claim 9 is cancelled above without prejudice.

Claims 1-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lungren (US 6,092,050) in view of Sanders (US 6,411,936). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Regarding independent claim 1, the Examiner correctly states that Lungren does not disclose entering said project management data model in a relational database. The Examiner then states that Sanders suggests this in col. 2, lines 40-56. However, Sanders does not describe or suggest this. What Sanders suggests is that knowledge management systems facilitate the collection, organization and transfer of knowledge aided by search engines, relational and object databases, GroupWare and other technologies. So Sanders states that knowledge management systems are aided by relational databases in facilitating the collection, organization and transfer of knowledge. He does not suggest that a project management data model is entered in a relational database.

The Examiner correctly states that Lungren does not describe building a project management tool for a project for production of a product or providing services having web pages from said text and graphical data. The Examiner states that Sanders suggests this in FIG. 10; col. 13, lines 8-65; col. 21, line 66 to col. 22, line 7. However, Sanders does not suggest this. First of all, FIG. 10 is not a project management tool at all. It can best be described as a value enhancement solution

generator for an enterprise. Nowhere in col. 13, which describes FIGs. 10-12, is there any suggestion of a project management tool. Nor is there any suggestion of a project management tool in cols. 21-22. Sanders simply does not address a project management tool, much less building one as required by claim 1.

Claim 1 also requires generating hyperlinks in the web pages of the project management tool based on the relationships in the relational database into which the project management data model was entered. The Examiner states that Sanders suggests this and again cites FIG. 10; col. 13, lines 8-65; col. 21, line 66 to col. 22, line 7. As stated above, there is no suggestion of a project management tool here, and certainly no suggestion of generating hyperlinks in the web pages of such a tool based on the relationships in the relational database into which the project management data model was entered.

Claim 1 is therefore allowable over the combination of Lungren and Sanders because neither independently or when taken together describes or suggests these three important steps of claim 1.

Likewise independent claims 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12 are allowable for the same reasons. All of the remaining claims depend directly on allowable claim 1 and are therefore also allowable.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based on the arguments above.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 08/20/2008

By: /John Pivnichny/

John R. Pivnichny

Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358

Fax: (607)429-4119